



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/534,495

05/10/2005

Andrew C. Lewin

124-1118

4506

23117 7590 01/27/2009
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

PUNNOOSE, ROY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2886

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/27/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

On Thursday, 08 January 2009 the Examiner indicated to SPE T. Chowdhury that prior art Tiao et al (U. S. Patent 6,318,863) read on several claims of the instant application, primarily claim 1. In the interest of expediency SPE Chowdhury telephoned Atty. Spooner to discuss the Examiner's finding. Atty. Spooner stated that he will call back on Monday, 12 January 2009 after discussing the matter with the inventors.

In the interview on Monday, 12 January 2009, Atty. Spooner argued that claim 1 has allowable subject matter because prior art Tiao et al (U.S Patent 6,318,863) does not teach the following:

1. A "structured light generator" for illuminating a scene (as in the preamble of claim 1);
2. The "projection optics arranged together with said light source and said light guide" so as to project an array of distinct images of the light source towards the scene; and,
3. A "projection lens" for projecting light to a scene (compared to prior art using a condenser lens for projecting light to a scene).

In response to Atty. Spooner's arguments, the Examiner and SPE Chowdhury contended that the prior art uses the principles of kaleidoscope which is the same principle that is used in applicant's claimed invention. The Examiner and SPE Chowdhury further contended that all the elements, the light source, the light guide and the projection lens as claimed in claim 1 of the instant application are clearly taught by prior art Tiao et al, specifically in col.10, line 65 - col.11, line 15, and Figure 11.

No agreement was reached. At the conclusion of the interview SPE Chowdhury indicated to Atty. Spooner that the Office's position will be conveyed to the applicant via an office action.